

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day).
Each volume contains twenty-six or twenty-seven issues.

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States.

Place of publication, Barnard College, New York, New York.
Editor, Charles Knapp (Barnard College, Columbia University).
Address, 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York, New York.

VOLUME XXVIII, No. 20

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1935

WHOLE No. 764

THE ARGUMENT USED SEVENTY-TWO TIMES IN THE CROWN SPEECH OF DEMOSTHENES¹

The favorite argument of Demosthenes in his Crown Speech is one that is said to be used seventy-two times in the speech. There are about two hundred and ninety Sections of actual text. An argument which occurs in approximately one-fourth of the Sections of the speech may be properly called a favorite argument. A Greek scholion which is affixed to Section 16 declares, 'It should be noted that there is much demurring <paragraphikon> in this speech. Some of the commentators have said that they have counted the *paragraphikon* and have found it occurring seventy-two times'². What is called *paragraphikon* in the scholion is a particular kind of issue or *status* defined by the rhetoricians.

There are three issues which meet a criminal charge directly. If a man is accused of homicide, he may enter a denial: he may say that the man was not killed by him. Admitting the fact, he may show that the killing was accidental, and therefore not to be defined as homicide. Finally, granting that there has been homicide, he may justify the homicide by claiming that he acted in self-defense. These three issues, of fact, of definition, and of justification meet the charge directly, and, if sustained, exonerate the accused.

When the argument does not refute the charge immediately in one of the three ways mentioned, the issue is called an indirect issue. The argument used by Demosthenes in the De Corona is of this kind. In the Rhetorica ad Herennium (1.22, 25) the argument is called *translatio*, an issue that, passing over the question of the truth or the falsity of the charge, holds that the charge should be transferred to another person, place, time, manner, deed, and the like. Cicero treats this argument in De Inventione (1. 8, 16, 2. 57), and calls it *translatio* and *commutatio*. Quintilian (3. 6. 23, 48, 56, 60, 62, 68, 72, etc.) uses the term *translatio*. Cicero also applies to the argument the legal term *exceptio* (De Inventione 2.57). The argument occurs rarely in trials because it is usually handled in a preliminary motion to quash the indictment. It is never a main issue in a court, and in Demosthenes, despite its frequent occurrence, it is still not a main issue, because it does not meet the accusations directly.

Cicero and Quintilian ascribe to the rhetorician Hermagoras the credit of defining this issue³. The argument has several names in Greek: *metalepsis*, *metastasis*, *methodos*, *paragraphike*. In my book, Persuasive Speech⁴, I have employed the term *flaw in the indictment*. Instances of the argument are cited there from Webster, Russell, and Curran. It is still used in the courts to discredit an attorney or his witness.

I

Demosthenes had a serious problem on his hands in replying to his adversary. He had to answer a clever opponent, who next to himself was the ablest speaker in Athens. Demosthenes had to defend his public life of almost twenty-five years and to uphold a policy which had ended in defeat and in loss of liberty to the Athenians. Ctesiphon, who had proposed that Demosthenes be crowned, seemed to have violated the letter of the law, and the legality of his proposal had to be established. Demosthenes must praise himself to show that Ctesiphon had not written a lie into the law in asserting that the policy of opposing Philip of Macedon was for the best interests of Athens. If Demosthenes himself was not responsible for the downfall of the Greeks, he must prove, if he could, that his opponent was the real cause of that downfall. What facts should he select, what order should he follow, how should he remove the prejudice created by his opponent, how interest his audience, prove his case, and win the votes of his judges was the puzzle of fragments which Demosthenes must fit into place without any original picture to guide him out of the wood-pile which an enemy's jig saw had heaped up before him.

The flaw in the indictment was an obvious, available argument. To abuse the attorney of the other side is a ready resort, and, in the case of Demosthenes, the resort was all the more compelling because on the other side accuser and attorney and life-long enemy were all one. But, if the flaw in the indictment is prompt to hand, it has also its weaknesses. In many ways the reasoning is an argument from silence and from abuse, and both these attacks are likely to be fallacious. If one asserts that the accuser has taken the wrong method, the wrong time, the wrong person, the wrong court, the wrong law, all these defects must be fully proved. That Demosthenes safeguards his argument has been shown

¹This paper was read at the Twenty-sixth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at Barnard College, Columbia University, April 28-29, 1933. <By arrangement with THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY the paper was published, in a somewhat different form, in Les Études Classiques 3.22-31 (January, 1934). C. K.>

²See G. H. Schaefer, Demosthenes, 2.509 (London, David Nutt, 1822).

³Some have tried to trace the status to Aristotle because he uses the term *metalepsis*, but the evidence is slight. Compare Gualtherus Jaeneke, De Statuum Doctrina ab Hermogene Tradita, 50 (Leipzig, Robert Noske, 1904).

⁴Persuasive Speech, An Art of Rhetoric for Colleges (New York, P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1931). <For a review, by Dr. Moses Hadas, of this book see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 27.55. C. K.>

by the Byzantine rhetorician, Sopater, quoted in Dindorf's *Demosthenes*⁵. The argument from silence is not fallacious if it is proved that the silence could have been broken and should have been broken. Hence Demosthenes is careful to point out that Aeschines had the opportunity, had the knowledge, had every reason and motive to attack the right person at the right time, in the right way, and so, if Aeschines had a 'flawed' indictment, the judges might properly conclude with Demosthenes, after his first long presentation of the argument (12-16), that 'all the accusations are for that reason, as one may easily see, unjust and based on no truth' (17).

It is not possible to point out exactly the seventy-two places in which the argument occurs. We do not know just what the scholiast includes in an argument which, without pronouncing on the charge itself, embraces every circumstance surrounding the charge, and we do not know what method of counting was followed by the scholiast. The simple identification, however, of every occurrence of the argument will not be as helpful or as profitable for an appreciation of Demosthenic eloquence and for the guidance of modern speakers as it will be to study this argument in order to illustrate the oratorical art of the world's foremost orator. Demosthenes's use of his favorite argument will reveal his masterly tactics, his powers of reasoning, his skill in effective refutation, his vehemence of style, his power of insistence, without monotony, his vigorous action, and his richness of imagination, all directed to his unrivaled capacity for persuasion.

II

The argument of the flaw in the indictment is felt, without explicit mention of it, through the whole exordium. Demosthenes declares that Aeschines, in his methods, is in opposition to the law and the judges (1, 2); he blames Aeschines for driving Demosthenes to self-praise (3, 4), and ironically asserts that Demosthenes himself is a party to the trial equally with Ctesiphon (5). With the help of the ubiquitous argument Demosthenes is able to postpone discussing the strictly legal points of accountability and proclamation, which were the weakest part of his defense. Aeschines has not kept to his own indictment (9) and has introduced the private life of Demosthenes (10, 11) and events of his public life (17-52) for which Demosthenes was not responsible. Therefore Demosthenes takes the offensive, and gives a miniature sketch of Aeschines and of his treachery in the Phocian War (this sketch is a small-scale picturing of the larger villainy of Aeschines in the Amphissian War that led to the defeat at Chaeronea and to the ruin of Greece). At this point in his speech (52) Demosthenes adroitly avails himself of the order in his opponent's indictment of Ctesiphon and so shifts the matter of accountability and proclamation to Section 110. When Demosthenes presents his direct issue, opposition to Philip (59), Aeschines's method of attack justifies that issue.

In a sense the whole speech is an example of *translatio*, because Demosthenes is not content to remove

the guilt from himself. He transfers the guilt to his adversary. Yet there are certain places where we have *translatio* explicitly and at length. A sketch could give us the geography of the flaw in the indictment, depicting its location and its extent. In the absence of such a chart I shall briefly point out the more prominent appearances of the argument and note their argumentative force. The first long instance is in Sections 12 to 16, where the argument may be said to take the form of an induction, enumerating the chief flaws, the spiteful motive, the failure to prosecute earlier, the tragic pose, the attack on Demosthenes through Ctesiphon. There is also here an induction of the various kinds of trials avoided by Aeschines. From these particulars Demosthenes draws the general conclusion (17) that the entire case is vitiated.

III

More frequently Demosthenes handles the argument deductively, drawing from various general principles his conclusions and putting the reasoning in the form of an *epicherema*, or syllogism with extended proof of the premises. In Sections 121 to 125 the general principle is the right and the wrong way of defining a statesman and of distinguishing accusation from abuse. In 188 to 191 the principle is the distinction between an adviser and a calumniator; in 199 to 206 the motives of Aeschines are contrasted with the patriotic past of Athens. In 222 to 226 the advantages of earlier prosecution are contrasted with the present prosecution, a principle found also in 124. In 273 to 275 official responsibility is defined, and the definition is used to show the malice of Aeschines. When Demosthenes, in 276 to 279, is treating eloquence, the method of Aeschines is shown to be inconsistent with patriotic oratory and in contrast with the oratory of Demosthenes. In the peroration, 307 to 309, a similar general principle is invoked.

The longer deductions and the shorter are varied in contents and in style and are presented in apt places, but they are not as immediately effective as the same argument put in the form of a dilemma. Aeschines either had no better plans than Demosthenes, and, in consequence, approved of Demosthenes, or had better plans, but suppressed them to help the enemy (139). Three times, just before the oath of Demosthenes, Aeschines is impaled on dilemmas. If Aeschines had better measures, he should have revealed them; if he did not have better measures, he was as guilty as Demosthenes (196). If he could have done better, he should have; if he could not have done better, he should have helped Demosthenes (197). If the city needs help, Aeschines is silent; if the city is harmed, Aeschines is vocal (198). A still more striking and forceful dilemma is presented in 217, where Aeschines is asked whether he rejoiced or sorrowed at the thanksgivings offered to the gods for the first successes against Philip after the Theban Alliance, and his present conduct is characterized as in either case deserving of condemnation. In 233 is still another dilemma.

The favorite argument takes also the form of analogy. Omitting for the present the analogy of relation between

⁵Wilhelm Dindorf, *Demosthenes*, 5.310 (Oxford, 1849).

things not of the same class, shown in metaphor and in similitude, we find Demosthenes comparing and contrasting Aeschines with others of his own class. He is compared with proverbial traitors, Eurybatus (23), Theocritus (313), with traitors elsewhere (48, 197, 295), with former malicious prosecutors (317), with Cephalus in not indicting Demosthenes (251). He is contrasted with the Athenians of the past (95-100, 199-208), with contemporary Athenians (191, 312), with others who prosecuted Demosthenes (83, 223), with his own party (70, 162), with Demosthenes, whose indictments never had such flaws (141), with heroes like Aeacus, Rhadamanthus, and Minos (127), and with the gods themselves (217, 290).

IV

The flaw in the indictment is most of all effective in refutation. It does not, it is true, refute a statement, but it tends to discredit the person who makes the statement, and has always been so used by orators. Demosthenes, as we have seen, appeals to this argument at the outset in order to weaken every argument of his opponent. The longer refutations in the speech begin with the argument; this is true of the handling of the legal points (111), the attack on Aeschines (126), the discussion of the Amphissian War (139, 141) and of the defeat at Chaeronea (244), the discussion of fortune (252), and of the comparison of eloquence (276). Shorter incidental refutations also begin with a reference to the flaw (22, 28, 41, 51).

Before the reading of documents, while the clerk is getting ready to read them, Demosthenes fills the pause by a recourse to the same argument (28, 76, 118). The so-called *Argumentum ad hominem* (the contradiction between the present statement of a speaker and his former statement or action), put in what is popularly called the deadly parallel, is a vigorous way of replying to an adversary and is most apt to the flaw in the indictment. Such personal arguments are found in 126, 163, 223, 245. The cleverest use of the personal argument is found in 251. Aeschines had said that Cephalus was honored because he never was indicted, though Demosthenes often was indicted. Demosthenes made answer that Cephalus was protected by a special providence, but added, 'for you, Aeschines, I am a Cephalus, because you never indicted me'.

If the flaw in the indictment is applicable to argumentation of all kinds and to refutation, it is even more suitable for appeals to emotion. How could a speaker bring his contentions to a more triumphant conclusion than by making a matter recoil upon the head of an adversary who has been so perversely wrong? Demosthenes concludes larger divisions of his speech with the help of his favorite argument. The initial refutation (52), the first justification (109), the legal objections (121-125), the indirect defense (159), the first phase of the Theban Alliance (210), the second phase (226), the recapitulation before the discussion of the defeat at Chaeronea (243), the main confirmation (251), the comparison of fortunes (275), the comparison of oratorical power and eloquence just before the peroration (206) all offer instances of the same recurring argument, with evidences, in the style, of heightened feeling.

V

It is with a consideration of the style of Demosthenes in handling this argument that this paper may be concluded. Butcher⁶ says,

... Demosthenes preferred repetition to copiousness; but in this sense that he frequently came back upon the dominant idea and enforced it, not with verbal repetition, but with fresh illustration. This is a capital feature in his eloquence. He is resolved to secure one of the high places in the field. From different quarters his forces converge upon this point; each avenue of escape is blocked beforehand.

There could be no more evident illustration of the characteristic described by Butcher than the argument discussed in this paper, and the illustration presented here is all the more convincing because Butcher does not refer to the flaw in the indictment.

In these repeated arguments we have fine evidence of the way in which Demosthenes grapples with his audience and especially with his adversary, in questions, in repeated challenges to him to tell a better way (64, 191, 199), in swift shifting of address from judges to Aeschines (11, 52, 196). The cumulative sentence that heaps thought upon thought, the universal pronouns, the concluding adverbs or negatives which come as a clap of thunder after a lightning flash and have the force of a full sentence in one word are prominent in the favorite argument. Demosthenes was criticized long ago for his use of synonyms, commonly in doublets. On the first appearance of the flaw in this speech Demosthenes uses *four* synonyms to stigmatize its vileness (12), and he enumerates *four* proper ways that Aeschines should, or might, have followed. Again, most of the instances of synonymous triplets are found in connection with the same flaw: we find triple adjectives in 13, 108, 119, 302, triple verbs in 23, 121, 291 (bis), triple nouns in 85, 126, 217, 273, 279, triple clauses in 282, 307. Demosthenes was noted for his action and his vigorous delivery. One of his frequent points in commenting on his adversary's method is a reference to his voice and his profession as an actor (for references to Aeschines's voice see 13, 82, 127, 313). Since Demosthenes sometimes used his favorite argument as a smoke-screen for weak arguments (121-125), so, in passages where he ridicules attacks on his own words and gestures (232), there may be traces of envy in his scorn for the superior voice and more graceful action of Aeschines.

Demosthenes tried to get every ounce of energy from his sentences. Hence, as in his favorite argument he heaped up thoughts and held on to them, so also he interrupted his sentence anywhere, by expletives, by vocatives, by questions, by inversions of phrase and of clause⁷. The Demosthenic parenthesis, which has been the subject of several studies, is another evidence of his force. These parentheses, which constitute oratorical footnotes, or asides, appear in the argument at 12-16, and are a source of the slight obscurity for which this passage has been criticized and discussed at tedious length. Two vehement parentheses, intro-

⁶See S. H. Butcher, *Demosthenes*, 157 (London, Macmillan, 1893).

⁷See Carolus Werther, *Imitationis Thucydidiae Vestigia in Demosthenis Orationibus* (Gissen, W. Keller, 1886).

duced, as parentheses often are, by *οὐ γὰρ*, interrupt the even flow of the paragraph, but, if they are seen to be parentheses, the 'obscurity' mostly disappears.

VI

We may omit the *hapax legomena*, the irony and other exhibitions of humor which accompany the favorite argument, and come to its last and most striking feature, its imaginative presentation. Variety was absolutely necessary if Demosthenes, in using this argument so frequently, would avoid intolerable monotony. It is the imagination which supplies variety. The mind dealing in abstractions and generalizations reduces variety to unity. The imagination picturing, as it must from its material nature, individuals in a definite time and place cannot find any two individuals alike in all respects. The imagination envisions the species, the individual, and the likeness of two individuals. We may call these three visions imagination of species, imagination of detail, and imagination of relation, corresponding roughly to metonymy, synecdoche, and metaphor.

Many manifestations of imagination have already been noted. In a general way every proper noun gives evidence of the specific working of the speaker's imagination, but its working is especially prominent in detecting analogies and in selecting significant detail through which the hearer shall picture the whole scene.

Many analogies of comparison have already been given. I shall present here a condensed list of the various objects to which in metaphor or in similitude Demosthenes likens Aeschines when he describes him as coming with his accusation at the wrong time, at the wrong place, and in the wrong way. The list resembles a whimsical paragraph of Lamb, but it will serve as an index to the Demosthenic imagination. Cicero in his speech for Marcellus sees Caesar under different guises restoring the 'Republic'. It is interesting to note the source and the variety of the analogies which Demosthenes employed in the Crown Speech in handling this one argument.

Aeschines, says Demosthenes, is a tragedian (13), a traveler off the road (14), an actor playing a part (15), a soldier attacking the wrong enemy (16), a sick stomach voiding its own nausea on others (50), a day laborer (51), a maker of hash (111), a delirious patient needing hellebore (121), a bird scavenger, a tramp (127), off-scourings (128), a handsome statue (129), a man trying to wash himself (140), a sower of evil seeds (159), a country actor (180), a banker of disaster (198), an old break or sprain aching again (198), a purblind scribe (209), a third-rate actor in statesmanship (209), a bad accountant (227), a poor bargainer (239), a fox, a dwarf, an ape, a counterfeit (242), a foolish doctor (243), a timid hare (263), a retreating soldier (273), a juggler (276), a voice exercizer (280), a sailor anchored in the enemy's harbor (281), maimed of his country (296), a user of false scales (298), a producer of poor fruits (309), no shining light (313), no athlete striving for Athens, but a contestant exerting himself for Philip (320). These various pictures charac-

terize the methods and the motives of Aeschines and so are connected with the flaw in the indictment.

A very imaginative presentation of the argument is found just before Demosthenes discusses the defeat at Chaeronea. Here Demosthenes caricatures his opponent, likening him to a doctor who refuses to prescribe for a sick patient until after his death and burial, when the doctor assures the sorrowing relatives that, had the patient done so and so, he would not have died (243). Another imaginative sketch, with less humor, but with more persuasiveness, is a dramatization of detail. The greatest moment perhaps in the career of Demosthenes was the morning after the night of terror, when the news of Philip's arrival at Elatea reached Athens and when no one of all present spoke in reply to the voice of their native land uttered through the herald. That was a battle, Demosthenes proudly claims, in which he himself did not retreat, but in which he won a complete victory. That scene Demosthenes dramatizes (194), putting on the lips of the herald the prescribed cry and rejecting the alternative cries which the indictment of Aeschines would offer. With a like magnificence of imagination Webster removes from the undiscovered stars and stripes of America's flag the motto of his opponent and emblazons upon the ample folds of the standard his own immortal saying. The eloquence of Demosthenes is likewise immortal even for the oratorical skill with which he handles one and the same simple argument seventy-two times. Perhaps it was that argument which contributed largely to the success of Demosthenes. Aeschines did not prescribe for the patient because he had no remedy to offer.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY,
NEW YORK, NEW YORK FRANCIS P. DONNELLY, S.J.

THE LAST THREE BOOKS OF XENOPHON'S ANABASIS¹

Many in these latter days, when pacifism is fashionable, belittle Xenophon and the *Anabasis*, and disparage the *Anabasis* as a war book which will rouse war feeling among the young. I do not regard the work in this light. I look upon it as a great book of adventure and exploration, picturing many young Greeks on a holiday expedition. Much is said of their games, their eating and their drinking, their experiences with novel foods and drinks, their discovery of new peoples and new ways of living and doing things, their delight in the novel experiences afforded by the expedition. We see cleverness in meeting new situations and resourcefulness on the part of the common soldier as well as on the part of the officer. These qualities should appeal to young men (perhaps more than to young women), just as they certainly appealed to the Greeks for whom Xenophon wrote.

I recently read over again the last three books, to renew my acquaintance with their contents. These books have always been read in American Schools less frequently than the first four books.

¹This paper was read at the Twenty-seventh Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at the College Misericordia, Villa St. Teresa, Dallas, Pennsylvania, May 4-5, 1934.

Xenophon never intended his work to end with the arrival of the Greeks at the sea at Trapezus, the modern Trebizond. He must not only bring the Greeks back to the sea and to Greek civilization, but must bring them back along the coast of the Euxine to Byzantium and ultimately lead them back into Asia Minor, to be mingled with the Spartan army of Thibron to fight against Tissaphernes.

I must frankly admit that the latter part of the *Anabasis* in general lacks for me the interest that the first part possesses. In the latter part we find a great deal of fighting and an unconscionable amount of plundering of towns and villages, for the Greeks needed food, and frequently the only way to get it was to take it by force. There is a great deal of talking and speechmaking, particularly in the seventh book, which to us is often boring; but the Greeks loved this from the bottom of their hearts.

A good deal is said about food, just as in the earlier books. Much is made of the food found by the hungry Greeks among the Mossynoeci, the bread, the spelt, the slices of pickled dolphin, the jars of dolphin fat, which the barbarians used just as the Greeks used olive oil, the chestnuts, the grain, and the good strong wine, which the Greeks found enjoyable only when it was tempered with water². Another happy occasion was the reception by the Greeks of meat and barley, wine, olives, and an abundance of garlic and onions³.

As in the earlier books, Xenophon freely gives geographical details and particularly the description of fruitful fields. An instance is in his description⁴ of the country near Calpe:

'The rest of the country is extensive and beautiful, and there are in it many inhabited villages, for the land produces barley and wheat, and all kinds of pulse, and millet and sesame, and figs in sufficient abundance, and many vines that yield sweet wine, and all the other things, except olives'.

There is a very full description of the banquet of Seuthes, King of the Thracians. There was the greatest abundance of food and drink. Seuthes took bread and broke it into small bits, which he threw to whom he pleased. He did the same with the meat, leaving himself only enough to taste. Others began to do the same thing. One Arystas, an Arcadian, described as a terrible eater, stopped throwing the food, and looked after his own needs by taking in his hand a huge loaf of bread and putting the meat in his lap. The wine was served in drinking-horns. Arystas, who was still busy eating, upon seeing Xenophon no longer eating, said to the boy who was serving the wine, 'Give it to him, for he is now at leisure, while I am not....' This remark occasioned great laughter when it was interpreted to Seuthes. There was free drinking to the health of Seuthes, and many gifts were made to him. The Greeks had been warned that custom demanded gifts on such an occasion. Xenophon was perplexed, for he had almost nothing. He makes the best of the situation, and offers Seuthes himself, and 'these my friends', to be Seuthes's allies and helpers in his schemes. The Thracian and the Greeks had discussed such plans. The

banquet wound up with wild music, a war-dance by Seuthes, and fun provided by buffoons⁵.

Much earlier than this the Greeks had had a banquet. But it was on a smaller scale, for, we are told, they sacrificed animals and had a satisfactory feast. This provided entertainment for the deputies of the ruler of Paphlagonia. The Greeks reclined on their low beds and drank from cups of horn which they found in the country. After they had poured the libations and had sung the paeon, they entertained with several of the Greek national dances. These, for the most part mimic war-dances, met with great approval on the part of the Paphlagonians⁶.

During one long halt, after sacrifices to the gods, the Greeks organized parades and held athletic games. Food was abundant at the time and there was general good feeling. Greeks can hold games anywhere⁷.

We learn of the fate of Chirisophus. For a time he had held the supreme command, after it had been offered to Xenophon and declined by him⁸. Chirisophus died at Calpe, of fever⁹.

Of the cold in Thrace, Xenophon writes¹⁰:

'... There was so much snow and it was so cold that the water which they carried for dinner froze, and the wine which was in the jars also froze, and the noses and the ears of many of the Greeks were frozen off. Then it became evident why the Thracians wear foxskin caps on their heads and over their ears, and shirts that cover not only their chests but their thighs as well, and why, when they ride horseback, they have, instead of short cloaks, wrappers that reach to their feet'.

The expedition to Salmydessus, on the southwest shore of the Black Sea, gives occasion to tell of this wild people and its way of finding a living. The account is as follows¹¹:

'There many of the ships that sail into the Pontus run aground and are wrecked, for there is a shoal extending far out into the sea. The Thracians who live in these parts set up boundaries and prey upon the vessels that are wrecked near them. They said that, before they set up these boundaries, many plunderers were killed by one another'.

Xenophon goes on to say that here were found many couches and many chests and many books, and many other things such as ship-masters carry in wooden containers.

Xenophon sacrifices quite often to Zeus, more frequently than we find in the earlier books, and seeks the will of heaven more frequently in sacrificial omens. He shows his religious attitude more clearly in this part of his story.

A very pleasant digression is the account of the place at Scillus to which Xenophon retired after he came back to Greece. Xenophon used part of his share of the spoil obtained in the campaign to make a votive offering to Apollo in Delphi. This was put in the Treasury of the Athenians in Delphi, and commemorated the name of Proxenus as well as his own. This gift was made in accordance with vows; and, still in accordance with vows, another part of the spoil was used for the purchase at Scillus of a place for the goddess Artemis. A stream named Selinus flowed through it, just as Se-

²5.4.27-29.³7.1.37.⁴6.4.6.⁵7.3.21-33.
⁶6.4.11.⁶6.1.4-13.
¹⁰7.4.3-4.⁷5.5.5.
¹¹7.5.13-14.⁸6.1.19-33.

linus flowed near the Temple of Artemis in Ephesus. There were fish and shellfish in both streams. On the place at Scillus there was fine hunting. An altar and a temple to Artemis were set up. A tenth of the income from the estate was dedicated to the goddess, and a festival was celebrated by the men and the women of the neighborhood. The goddess was said to supply to those who camped about barley and bread, wine, sweetmeats, a portion of the offerings and of the animals taken in the hunt. Boars, deer, and gazelles were hunted in the neighborhood. The place was only two miles or a little more from Olympia. The temple was the Ephesian temple on a small scale; the image, of cypress wood, was like the golden image in Ephesus. Near the temple stood a *stèle* with this inscription on it: 'This place is sacred to Artemis. He who holds it and enjoys its benefits must sacrifice the tenth each year. From the remainder he must take care of the temple. If any one fails to do this, it shall be the concern of the goddess'¹². We can imagine Xenophon's joy and satisfaction as he spent his later years in this delightful place, indulging his love of hunting and writing.

From Trapezus to Thrace the Greeks make their way by sea and by land, amid many difficulties and misunderstandings with the natives, and some deception too. There are many fights, many maraudings, and many attempts to make treaties. The Greeks are evidently burdened somewhat by women and children, for in the early part of the story we read that, while most of the Greeks are marching by land, they put in the boats those who were sick and those who were more than forty years old, and children and women, and the baggage which was not absolutely necessary. Philisus and Sophaenetus, the eldest of the generals, were put on board the ships with orders to care for these persons and things¹³. Just at this time, during their halt at Cerasus, a review under arms was held, and the force was numbered, and there were found to be 8,600 soldiers. These were brought back safely; but the others had perished at the hands of the enemy, or from the snow, or from disease¹⁴.

Nobody wants this big force of armed Greeks around; everybody is glad to get rid of it. The Greeks themselves frequently do not know what to do. Xenophon is accused of wanting to settle them somewhere and so found a city, instead of getting them back to Greece¹⁵. This passage is significant as explaining the eagerness of the Greeks to come back to Greece:

'The majority of the soldiers had not made the expedition because of need, but they had undertaken service for pay when they heard of the goodness of Cyrus. Some brought troops with them, and some spent money too; some had run away from fathers and mothers, and some had left children, in the hope that they would return with wealth for them, or they heard that others who had taken service with Cyrus had fared very well. Since they were men of this type, they longed to be brought back safely to Greece'¹⁶.

There are troubles among the Greeks themselves, and even mutiny. The Arcadians and the Achaeans go so far as to break away from the army, leave Chi-

risophus and Xenophon, and choose their own officers. They went their own way and got into a lot of trouble, from which they were rescued by Xenophon¹⁷. More than once there is harsh criticism of Xenophon, and he meets with much blame, unmerited. He is accused of striking a man during the retreat. It is only because of his able defense that he wins justification; the man was disobedient when he was ordered to carry a disabled companion, and even started to bury him alive¹⁸. Xenophon is accused, too, of trying to look out for his own interests in his negotiations, particularly with Seuthes, but, if we may trust his defense, he gained nothing for himself¹⁹.

On the other hand, there are some fine tributes to their leader, of which Xenophon had, I think, a right to be proud. Xenophon, in defending himself against his critics and accusers, asks them to remember some of the good things and not only the bad, and reminds them that, when they were in trouble, they called him father and promised always to remember him as a benefactor²⁰. Toward the end of their adventures, when an effort was made to displace Xenophon, and promises of two months' pay were made to the soldiers, Timasion, who had not been altogether kindly disposed to Xenophon earlier, said, 'Not even if there is going to be five months' pay, would I make the campaign without Xenophon'. Phryniskus and Cleanor agreed with Timasion²¹. Again, when the Lacedaemonian messengers ask what kind of a man Xenophon is, Seuthes answers, '... in other respects he is not bad, but he is too fond of his soldiers, and for this reason it is worse for him'²².

When the army reached Europe, it was used by Seuthes in his schemes. But Xenophon realized that, whatever becomes of them, they must have the good will of the Lacedaemonians, for the Lacedaemonians were now in control of Greece. For some time the Lacedaemonians do not seem eager to receive them. The Greeks cross over to Byzantium because of the promises of Anaxibius, the Spartan admiral. Pharnabazus had urged Anaxibius to get the army out of Asia, because he feared that the army would make a campaign against his country. This was one of the occasions when Xenophon hoped to leave the army, but Anaxibius urged him to stay²³. Next we find great eagerness to get the army out of Byzantium; and, when it is led out, the gates are hastily shut and barred after their departure. But the Greeks, feeling that they have been betrayed, reenter the city by force, storming the gates; some even came along the seawall. Xenophon is hard put to it to calm the troops and keep them within bounds. Amid the criticisms and accusations and the break-up of discipline, Xenophon keeps a cool head, and by diplomacy and good leadership manages to save the Greeks²⁴.

After the Greeks are finally gotten out of Byzantium, when there is some discussion among them whether to go to Seuthes, or to the Chersonese, or back to Asia Minor, and some of the Greeks were leaving as best they could, Anaxibius rejoiced when he heard that the

¹²5.3.5-13.¹³5.3.1.¹⁴5.3.3.¹⁵5.6.15-17, 6.4.7.¹⁶6.4.8.¹⁷6.2.9-6.3.26.¹⁸5.8.1-18.¹⁹7.6.4.²⁰7.6.7-20.²¹7.6.38.²²7.1.2-4.²³7.1.8-32.²⁴7.5.10.

army was breaking up, for he thought that, if this happened, he would gratify Pharnabazus exceedingly²⁶. But the Greeks were still numerous enough to cause grave anxiety.

At last messengers come from the Spartan Thibron, saying that he is going to march against Tissaphernes in Asia Minor and needs these Greek troops, and he promises the customary pay. Seuthes, who had not done very well in making good his promises to pay, is persuaded by Xenophon to do something. He sends the Greeks one talent, 600 oxen, 4000 sheep, 120 slaves, and some hostages. The Greeks leave him in more friendly mood. Xenophon handed these gifts over to the Lacedaemonian ambassadors, acknowledging the dependence of the Greeks upon them, with the request that they make the distribution to the troops. But the Lacedaemonians appointed men to sell the booty and so sold it. They incurred much blame for the way they behaved in the matter. Meanwhile Xenophon was packing up to go home, but he was induced to remain until he should lead the army to Thibron and hand it over to him²⁷.

The Greeks crossed over from the European side to Lampsacus. Here Xenophon was compelled by necessity to sell his horse. He received a good price for it. But, when two Lacedaemonians came with money for the army, they heard of this, and they performed a kind act²⁷:

'suspecting that Xenophon had sold the horse because of his need, (for they had heard that he took much pleasure in the horse), they bought it back and gave it to him, and refused to accept the price of it'.

The Greeks marched to Pergamus, and they enjoyed a little more fighting and plundering. Xenophon received his share of the spoil, with which he was evidently well satisfied, and was ready to take his leave, for at this point the work ends with this statement²⁸.

'At this time Thibron arrived and took over the army, and joining it to the rest of the Greek force carried on war against Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus'.

What happened to Xenophon after this? We are not told here. But, as he had been eager for some time to go home, he probably took his leave at this time. He is supposed to have returned to Athens. From other sources we know that later he was in the service of Agesilaus of Sparta. He returned with Agesilaus through Thrace and Macedonia, and was present—perhaps even fought—at the Battle of Coronea against the Athenians and the Thebans. Sometime during this period he was exiled from Athens. We do not know why. Some of the ancients said it was because he had joined in the expedition of Cyrus; according to another authority it was because of Laconism or sympathy with Sparta. I think the first is unlikely; the second seems more reasonable, for he did have Spartan leanings. If he made the expedition with Agesilaus, and particularly if he fought at Coronea, this would seem a sufficient reason for his exile from Athens, provided that the decree of exile was passed after this event. But we do not know the dates and the details.

Xenophon was married and had two sons, named Gryllus and Diodorus, whom the Spartans nicknamed the Dioscuri. He spent some time at Sparta, and later the Spartans presented him with the house and the farm at Scillus. There he lived happily for a number of years, 'hunting, entertaining his friends, and composing his histories'.

I wish we could leave him there. But this happiness did not continue till the end of his life. Probably at the time of the Lacedaemonian defeat at Leuctra in 371, the Eleans drove Xenophon out of Scillus. Then he went to Corinth. His sentence of exile was rescinded; his sons served in the Athenian cavalry, one meeting death in battle; and, although we know nothing of his later life, he is with good reason supposed to have lived to a good old age.

MUHLBERG COLLEGE,
ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA

ROBERT C. HORN

REVIEWS

Corinth: Results of Excavations Conducted <at Corinth> by The American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume 4, Part 2: Terracotta Lamps. By Oscar Broneer. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (1930). Pp. xx, 339. 210 Figures, 33 Plates.

Dr. Broneer's monograph, on the terracotta lamps found at Corinth is a monumental work in a humble field of human activity. The lamp originated as soon as clay-working was understood and practised, that is to say, the lamp came into being in the Neolithic Age, along with pottery. The craft developed rapidly in Egypt, and eventually spread to Crete and to the mainland of Greece. During the Geometric Period the lamp was, apparently, unknown, but it may well be that our knowledge here is imperfect; almost all 'geometric' sites that have been examined hitherto are of the 'telescoped' variety, and thus fail to provide anything like a complete fund of knowledge relative to the civilization of that period.

As a result, perhaps, of Oriental influences, the terracotta lamp became a part of the regular furnishings of the Greek house toward the end of the seventh century B. C. Thereafter there is an unbroken series of lamps through Classical Greek, Hellenistic Greek, and Roman times, down into the Middle Ages.

In the course of the excavations which were sporadically conducted at Corinth between 1896 and 1928, more than 1500 lamps—in widely differing conditions of preservation—were discovered. The dates of these lamps range from about 600 B. C. to the twelfth or thirteenth century of our era. A splendid array of material was thus provided for anyone who had the time and the inclination to undertake the minute study of a matter that had previously been seriously neglected. Fortunately for the outcome, the duty of investigating the collection devolved upon Dr. Broneer, who has performed his task with such eminent success that the volume under review, in which are recorded the results of his researches, is undoubtedly destined to serve for many years as the basis of future studies in this field.

²⁶7.2.4. ²⁷7. Chapters 6-7. ²⁸7.8.6.
²⁹7.8.7-24.

In the past, the Roman lamp has fared somewhat better than the Greek at the hands of scholars. This Dr. Broneer explains as follows (3):

... The Roman and some of the Hellenistic lamps are particularly interesting because of the light they throw on contemporary works of art, questions of mythology and religion, forms of amusement, domestic and social life among the ancients, and the like. The Greek lamps, being for the most part undecorated, are in this respect of less interest . . .

But the study of the relatively humble Greek lamp is, none the less, of prime importance because the lamp runs a course parallel with that of pottery. Consequently, its development keeps pace with the intellectual and artistic progress of the makers themselves. The form and the line of the Greek lamp are always interesting even though the vessel may lack surface decoration.

Dr. Broneer has divided the Corinthian lamps into 37 categories. Thus, among the 136 examples that belong to the Classical Greek period 7 types are found. The 235 items from the Hellenistic Age are separated into 12 categories. Roman and Early Christian lamps are regarded as a single group. They number 1145, and are arranged in 15 classes. The 46 Byzantine lamps show 3 types. Only three examples out of this great collection of 1560 lamps remain unclassified; these are distinctly freaks.

There are 210 Figures in the text that fully illustrate the types of lamp found at Corinth, together with parallels from other sites. The finer examples are reserved for Plates 1-29; these are of extremely fine execution. Plates 30 to 33 contain facsimiles of the inscriptions that occur on the lamps. They are, as a rule, nothing more than the initials or the name of the maker, sometimes in the nominative case, more often in the genitive.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

A. D. FRASER

Excavations at Olynthus. Part 3: The Coins Found at Olynthus in 1928. By David M. Robinson. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford: University Press (1931). Pp. xiv, 129. 2 Figures, 28 Plates. \$10.

Excavations at Olynthus. Part 6: The Coins Found at Olynthus in 1931. By David M. Robinson. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford: University Press (1933). Pp. xiv, 111. 2 Figures, 30 Plates. \$10.

The excavations conducted by Professor David M. Robinson at Olynthus in the Spring of 1928 and 1931 brought to light upwards of 2000 coins. This wealth of numismatic material is published by him in the two handsome volumes whose titles appear above.

A distinct service is rendered to the learned world by Professor Robinson through this timely and complete publication. Many former excavators were inclined to slight the value of the coin except for its aid in establishing a more exact chronology of the various strata of the site than would be possible through the medium of objects less capable of being dated with precision. In a few instances only have complete accounts appeared of coins thus discovered, and these were brought

out long after the enthusiasm engendered by the excavation itself evaporated. Professor Robinson has set an excellent example to future excavators in his prompt publication of the numismatic finds.

A great number of Greek city states contributed their coins to the Olynthian collection. Olynthus, with its ready access to the sea and its location on the line of the trade route through Macedonia and Thrace, occupied a strategic position commercially. It also enjoyed unusual political preeminence as head of the Chalcidic League. This organization was formed, in the opinion of most scholars, about the year 430 B.C.¹ I am inclined to think that it came into being by a gradual process of political evolution that comprises the half century between that date and 380 B.C. However this may be, the great majority of Olynthian coins bears the types and the symbols of this Chalcidic League, though the name of the city itself occurs rarely.

It would be impossible, without the consumption of a great deal of space, to discuss the details of this large and interesting collection of coins. The mention of a few of its most picturesque features must suffice. There are at least eight new coin-types—a triumph in itself for the excavators in view of the vast numbers of coins that have been reviewed in the past century. Five hoards were unearthed—four of silver coins, one of bronze coins. Most interesting of all is the occurrence of a hoard of more than thirty unstruck flans. Possibly they were awaiting the final processes of minting when Philip of Macedon arrived with his siege engines in 348 B.C. and brought the history of the city to an end. This appears to be the first time on record when such a discovery was made, at least in so far as bronze flans are concerned. A number of silver flans came to light some years ago in Eretria.

No silver coin of Alexander the Great was discovered. When we consider the huge issues of those coins and their wide distribution in the ancient world, we feel that their absence from the Olynthian site provides strong proof of what Professor Robinson has long maintained, that the city remained in ruins after its destruction at the hands of Alexander's father. The long-continued persistence of the name 'Olynthian', which adheres to certain families for ages afterwards, is as yet unexplained.

The illustrations of the books are profuse and of high quality from the technical point of view. The unique practice has been adopted of employing photographs made directly from the coins and not, as is usually done, from casts. This experiment has its disadvantages as well as its merits. The chief of the former is that the observer has sometimes a difficulty in differentiating color from contour. A compromise is offered, however, in the later volume where we find six Plates of reproductions (24-29) that show the orthodox method.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

A. D. FRASER

¹In *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 27:93-94 Professor Fraser reviewed a monograph, by Dr. Mabel Gude, entitled *A History of Olynthus, With A Prosopographia and Testimonia* (The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933). In that review Professor Fraser discussed at greater length the matter of the date of the development of the Chalcidic League. C. K. >